APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,518	08/02/2003	Jared Green	13768.783.92	4345

47973   7590   01/04/2007
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/632,518	GREEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LeChi Truong	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 August 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-51 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

2.   Claims 22, 40-51 are rejected as non-statutory because it is not tangibly embodied.

Claims 22 and 40 recite " A computer-readable medium ". The specification (page 8, ln

18) defines data signal such as a carrier wave. Carrier wave is incapable of being touched or

perceived absent the tangible medium through which they are conveyed; therefore, claims 22 and

40 are non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims **1, 2, 40, 45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dawson et al (US 6,230,198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,065,556 B1).

As to claim 1, Dawson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a

configuration request (received event is received directly from a client; generating a server-to-

server event message for said received event, col 9, ln 18-21/a sever-to-server event message 50,

col 5, ln 64-67/ the logging event message generator 53 responds to one of the received client or

server events for which the coupled server 17 is a receiver by generating a server-to-server event

massage 50, col 5, ln 64-67/ the logging event message generator generates a server-to server

event message in response to the request from the client), indicating(source trail of received

message, col 9, ln 45-50/ A server –to –server event message is generated for the received event,

the message including: ... a source trail indicating, col 2, ln 24-28/ the event message is

transmitted to the receiving server only if the receiver server identifier is absent from the parsed

source trail, col 2, ln 40-43), a set of one or more receivers(the ones of receivers 12, 30, 32, 34,

36, 37, 38, col 5, ln 57-59), receiving a configuration request, the configuration request

indicating a set of one or more devices to which to log messages(col 8, ln 45-48/ ln 62-65/col 9,

ln 45-50), and publishing the message to the set of one or more receiver(col 8, ln 45-48/ ln 62-

65/col 9, ln 45-50).

Dawson does not explicitly teach instantiating the set of one more devices, receiving a

request to log message. However, Hickey teaches instantiating the set of one more devices (at

least one peripheral device operable connected to a server, col 1, ln 5-10/ col 35-40/ Fig. 1),

receiving a request to log message (request to log and event, col 3, ln 47-48).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson and Hickey because Hickey's instantiating the set

of one more devices, receiving a request to log message would improve the efficiency of

Dawson's system by allowing logging event data can be maintained for a persistent connection

when the event data being downloaded and allowing the server to attend to multiple requests.

As to claim 2, Dawson teaches creating a trace object (col 2, ln 24-30).

As to claim 40, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Hickey teaches registering each device in the set with a

publisher (registering device operable connected to a server using a log manager device driver.

The method includes the steps of registering the log manager driver with a server to receive all

incoming event data, col 2, and ln 34-35).

As to claim 45, it is an apparatus claim of claim 2; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 2 above.

4.   Claims **3, 46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al

(US 6,230198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,065556 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and

further in view of Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1).

As to claim 3, Dawson and Hickey do not teach the trace object is formatted in

accordance with an extensible markup language (XML). However, Elmore teaches the trace

object is formatted in accordance with an extensible markup language (XML)(logging service

maintains an XML file which specifies a list of value are used to determine whether to log a

message, right col 134, ln 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey and Elmore because Elmore's an extensible

markup language (XML) would improve the efficiency of Dawson and Hickey's systems by

providing a messages contain identifiers for the security of log event.

As to claim 46, it is an apparatus claim of claim 3; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 3 above.

5.   Claims **4, 5, 9, 43, 51** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,065556 B1), as applied to claim 1

above, and further in view of Austen et al (US 6,842870 B2).

As to claim 4, Dawson and Hickey do not teach each device is associated with an

indication of the types of message logged. However, Austen teaches each device is associated

with an indication of the types of messages logged (identifying an error type for the error log,

responsive to an identification that the error log is a regional error log, identifying each partition

to receive the error log, col 7, ln 24-30).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey and Austen because Austen's each device

is associated with an indication of the types of messages logged would improve the efficiency of

Dawson and Hickey's systems by providing an improved instruction of computer for handling

particular errors log to corresponding logically partitioned data processing system.

As to claim 5, Dawson teaches publishing the message further comprises sending a

pointer to each device that logs messages of a type associated with the message, the pointer

pointing to memory that includes the trace object (col 9, ln 18-25).

As to claim 9, Austen teaches an environment variable (col 4, ln 32-37).

As to claim 43, it is an apparatus claim of claim 9; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 9 above.

As to claim 51, Austen teaches indicating what type of message or types of message to publish to the device (col 5, ln 29-37).

6.   Claims **6-8, 41-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,065556 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Josyula et al (US 2004/0028059 A1).

As to claim 6, Dawson and Hickey do not teach a command line parameter. However, Josyula teaches a command line parameter (command line interface (CLI) shells 330, para [0040], ln 11-19/ para [0042], ln 3-12).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey and Josyula because Josyula's a command line parameter would improve the efficiency of Dawson and Hickey's systems by allowing a user can manipulate the network node through the CLI shell.

As to claim 7, Dawson teaches database (col 4, ln 32-35) and Josyula teaches the command line parameter indicates that the set of devices to which to log messages is in a database (Para [0040], ln 3-12).

As to claim 8, Hickey teaches   a registry (col 2, ln 58-62).

As to claims 41, 42, they are apparatus claims of claims 6, 7; therefore, they are rejected

for the same reasons as claims 6, 7 above.

7.   Claims **10, 13-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,065556 B1), as applied to claim 1

above, and further in view of Currey et al (US 6,769079 B1).

As to claim 10, Dawson and Hickey do not teach calling a filter to indicate that the

message is available to be logged. However, Currey teaches calling a filter to indicate that the

message is available to be logged (allowing filtering to determine which log message go to

which of the specified destinations 68, 10, 72, based on a limited type of source information

associated with the process that calls syslog (), col 4, ln 59-65).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey and Currey because Currey's calling a filter

to indicate that the message is available to be logged would   improve the efficiency of Dawson

and Hickey's systems by providing a reliable and flexible logging of error which allows

messages to be filtered and forwarded to different destination as desired.

As to claim 13, Dawson teaches the message to determine whether to send the message

or data derived from the message to a device (col 6, ln 40-45).

As to claim 14, Currey teaches the request to log a message comes from a current thread

(col 5, ln 52-55).

8.   Claims **11, 47** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et

al (US 6,230198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,065556 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, in view

of Currey et al (US 6,769079 B1) and further in view of Chirashnya et al (US. Patent 6,598179

B1).

        As to claim 11, Dawson, Hickey and Currey do not teach the filter is called through a

callback function. However, Chirashnya teaches the filter is called through a callback function

(list of errors in the filtering table and criteria defined by callback functions 32, col 5, ln 23-24).

        It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey, Currey and Chirashnya because

Chirashnya's the filter is called through a callback function would   improve the efficiency of

Dawson, Hickey and Currey's systems by allowing the callback function script to check each

error type for relevance thus the error selection criteria can be easily modified and added to

without recompilation of the system.

        As to claim 47, it is an apparatus claim of claim 11; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 11 above.

9.   Claim **12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over   Dawson et al

(US 6,230198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,065556 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of

Currey et al (US 6,769079 B1) and further in view Suwaki (Event Report Management method).

As to claim 12, Dawson, Hickey and Currey do not teach a notification by the filter that a test has completed. However, Suwaki teaches a notification by the filter that a test has completed (a filter test to notification and informs a manager of this test contents, page 2, ln 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey, Currey and Suwaki because Suwaki 's a notification by the filter would improve the efficiency of Dawson, Hickey and Currey's systems by reducing the memory capacity necessary for holding the information.

10.   Claims **15-18, 48-49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,065556 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Currey et al (US 6,769079 B1) and further in view of Maurille (US 6,484,196 B1).

As to claim 15, Dawson , Hickey and Currey do not teach providing a context identifier that identifies a context of the current thread. However, Maurille teaches providing a context identifier that identifies a context of the current thread (threading information (parent and child message ID), col 3, ln 18-23/ thread ID, col 8, ln 31-34).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey, Currey and Maurille because Maurille 's the filter is called through a callback function would improve the efficiency of Dawson, Hickey and Currey's systems by allowing the internet with two levels of threading to transfer information between the nodes smoothly.

As to claim 16, Maurille teaches the context identifier further identifies a context of a parent thread associated with the current thread (col 3, ln 18-23/ col 8, ln 33-38).

As to claim 17, Maurille teaches publishing the message comprises providing information that uniquely identifies the thread (col 9, ln 10-15).

As to claim 18, Maurille teaches the information comprises an identifier that identifies a machine on which the current thread executes, a name of a process that spawned the current thread, an identifier that identifies the process, and an identifier that identifies the thread (col 3, ln 15-25).

As to claims 48, 49, they are apparatus claims of claims 15, 16, 18; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 15, 16, 18 above.

11.   Claims **19-22, 50** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,065556 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1).

As to claim 19, Dawson and Hickey do not teach receiving the configuration request occurs after an application that requests to log the message has been compiled, such that the application is not required to be recompiled to publish messages. However Kougiouries teaches receiving the configuration request occurs after an application that requests to log the message has been compiled (When requesting a client-side logging component to log an event, a module may pass the event mask information to determine whether the event is associated with a category, para [0060], ln 7-12/ If the client sign logging component determines that the event

received from the client-side logging component may timestamp the event... creating a data structure representing the event, para[0077], ln 1-8), application is not required to be recompiled to publish messages(the types of events they sent to the centralized event lob, without requiring code to be recompiled, or the event service to be re-started, para[0008], ln 5-8).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey and Kougiouris because Kougiouris 's the configuration request occurs after an application that requests to log the message, the application is not required to be recompiled would improve the efficiency of Dawson, Hickey's systems avoiding any possible overhead involved in process switching.

As to claim 20, Kougiouris teaches the message is published on a first machine and wherein the request to log the message is received from a second machine (para [0086], ln 4-10/ para [0088], ln 1-6).

As to claim 21, Kougiouris teaches combining a request to log a first message from the first machine with a request to log a second message received from the second machine before publishing the message on the first machine (right col 7, ln 25-29).

As to claim 22, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

As to claim 50, it is an apparatus claim of claim 20; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 20 above.

12.   Claims **23-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) in view of Dawson et al (6,230,198 B1).

As to claim 23, Kougiouris teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a logger (the client-side logging component 106, para [0049], ln 1-6/ para [0064], ln 5-10), an interface configured (various functions or methods callable by module 108, para [0064], ln 3-5), a request (requesting, para [0060], ln 7-12), logger having an interface configured to receive a request to log a message (para [0063], ln 5-10/ para [0060], ln 7-12), a local publisher (the server side logging component, para[0086], ln 4-10), a log message(log event information, para[0088], ln 1-6), a local publisher configured to receive a log message from the logger(para[0086], ln 4-10/ para[0080], ln 1-6)

Kougiouris does not explicitly teach a set of one or more devices configured to log messages, the set selectable at run time. However, Dawson teaches a set of one or more devices configured to log messages (various receivers are typically provided to receive certain of the events... example of receivers which are part of the server subsystem include server console 12, ... database, col 4, ln 28-35), the set selectable at run time (the logging distributor 54 examines the parsed source trail 62 of step 114 for the identifier of the coupled receiving server 18, col 45-50/ Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Kougiouris and Dawson because Dawson's a set of one or more devices configured to log messages, the set selectable at run time would improve the teaching of Kougiouris's system by allowing the logging system to log the event to appropriate receivers thereby avoiding a loop.

As to claim 24, Kougiouris teaches a filter configured to receive a notification when the local publisher publishes a message. (para [0093], ln 3-9).

13.   Claims **25, 28, 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) in view of Dawson et al (6,230,198 B1), as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Austen et al (US 6,842870 B2).

As to claim 25, Kougiouris and Dawson do not teach the filter determines whether to forward the message or data derived from the message to one of the devices. However, Austen teaches the filter determines whether to forward the message or data derived from the message to one of the devices (filtering error logs such that only errors that pertain to a particular partition are reported to that partition, col 5, ln 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Kougiouris and Dawson and Austen because Austen's each device is associated with an indication of the types of messages logged would improve the efficiency of Kougiouris and Dawson's systems by providing an improved instruction of computer for handling errors logs in a logically partitioned data processing system.

As to claims 28 and 29, Kougiouris teaches the interface provides access to methods associated with the logger, the interface being customized to operate with a programming language or programming model, wherein the programming model comprises a component object model (COM)(para [0092], ln 6-11).

14.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kougiouris et al

(US 2005/0028171 A1) in view of Dawson et al (6,230,198 B1), as applied to claim 23 above, in

view of Austen et al (US 6,842870 B2), and further in view Suwaki (Event Report Management

method).

As to claim 26, Kougiouris, Dawson, Austen do not teach a notification by the filter that

a test has completed. However, Suwaki teaches a notification by the filter that a test has

completed (a filter test to notification and informs a manager of this test contents, page 2, ln 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Kougiouris, Dawson, Austen and Suwaki because Suwaki 's

a notification by the filter would   improve the efficiency of Kougiouris, Dawson and Austen's

systems by providing the memory capacity necessary for holding the information can be reduced.

15.   Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kougiouris et al

(US 2005/0028171 A1) in view of Dawson et al (6,230,198 B1), as applied to claim 23 above, in

view of Austen et al (US 6,842870 B2) and further in view of Chirashnya et al (US. Patent

6,598179 B1).

As to claim 27, Kougiouris, Dawson, Austen do not teach the filter is called through a

callback function. However, Chirashnya teaches the filter is called through a callback function

(list of errors in the filtering table and criteria defined by callback functions 32, col 5, ln 23-24).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Kougiouris, Dawson, Austen and Chirashnya because Chirashnya's the filter is called through a callback function would improve the efficiency of Kougiouris, Dawson and Austen's systems by allowing the callback function script to check each error type for relevance thus the error selection criteria can be easily modified and added to without recompilation of the system.

16.   Claims **30-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) in view of Dawson et al (6,230,198 B1), as applied to claim 23, and further in view of Mohan (US. Patent 5,418940).

As to claim 30, Kougiouris and Drawson do not teach allocates a buffer. However, Mohan teaches allocates a buffer (allocated a log buffer 20 from main memory for storage of log records destined for system log 21, col 6, ln 41-44).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Kougiouris, Dawson and Mohan because Mohan's teach allocates a buffer would improve the efficiency of Kougiouris, Dawson 's systems by allowing a buffer to be transmitted out for recording to minimize the seek and latency delays.

As to claim 31, Mohan teaches allocates memory from the buffer to receive the log message (col 6, ln 42-44).

17.   Claims **32-39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kougiouris

et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) in view of Dawson et al (6,230,198 B1), as applied to claim 23, and

further in view of Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1).

        As to claim 32, Dawson teaches trace object (col 2, ln 24-30)

        Kougiouris and Dawson do not teach   log message in an extensible markup language

(XML). However, Elmore teaches log message in an extensible markup language

(XML)(logging service maintains an XML file which specifies a list of value are used to

determine whether to log a·message, right col 134, ln 40-43).

        It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Kougiouris, Dawson and Elmore because Elmore's an

extensible markup language (XML) would improve the efficiency of Kougiouris, Dawson

systems by providing a messages contain identifiers for the security of log event.

        As to claim 33, Kougiouris teaches an application configured to request that messages be

logged via the logger (para [0086], ln 5-6).

        As to claim 34, Kougiouirs teaches   the application operates asynchronously with

respect to the logger (para [0077], ln 8-12).

        As to claim 35, Kougiourirs teaches the application continues executing even if there is

insufficient memory to log the message (para [0078], ln 10-15).

        As to claim 36, Kougiourirs teaches   the application operates synchronously with respect

to the logger (para [0077], ln 6-8).

As to claim 37, Dawson teaches the set of one or more devices is selected after the application is compiled (col 5, ln 50-60).

As to claim 38, Kougiourirs teaches each device is configured to transform a received log message for display, output, storage, or transmission(para[0046], ln 1-12).

As to claim 39, Kougiourirs teaches a reader configured to read a trace comprised of data derived from the log messages and to display the trace in a hierarchical manner (para [0046], ln 1-12).

18.   Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Hickey et al (US 7,095556 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Josyula et al (US 2004/0028059 A1) and further in view of Austen et al (US 6,842870 B2).

As to claim 44, Dawson and Hickey do not teach a command line parameter. However, Josyula teaches a command line parameter (command line interface (CLI) shells 330, para [0040], ln 11-19/ para [0042], ln 3-12).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey and Josyula because Josyula's a command line parameter would improve the efficiency of Dawson and Hickey's systems by allowing a user can manipulate the network node through the CLI shell.

Dawson, Hickey and Josyula do not teach an environment variable. However, Austen teaches an environment variable (Operating system 201a-204 a exist, col 4, ln 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Hickey, Josyula and Austen because Austen's an

environment available would improve the efficiency of Dawson and Hickey's systems by

providing an improved instruction of computer for handling errors logs in a logically partitioned

data processing system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomson, William can be reached on (571) 272 3718. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

December 22, 2006

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER